



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/732,960

12/11/2003

Graham N. Pearce

555255012668

9286

33787 7590 06/04/2007  
JOHN J. OSKOREP, ESQ.  
ONE MAGNIFICENT MILE CENTER  
980 N. MICHIGAN AVE.  
SUITE 1400  
CHICAGO, IL 60611

EXAMINER

EKONG, EMEM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/04/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/732,960	Applicant(s) PEARCE, GRAHAM N.	
	Examiner EMEM EKONG	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 11-13 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 14-19, and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                        |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 03/13/2007 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
2. **Claims 1-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0165012 A1 to Kirbas et al. in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0198335 A1 to Campen, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0184593 A1 to Elsey et al.

**Regarding claims 1 and 5, Kirbas et al. discloses** a wireless communication device for use by an individual of an enterprise, comprising: a radio modem which receives long distance call restriction information (paragraph 0006 lines 6-11, pars. 17-18, and paragraph 0026 lines 5-7, i.e. wireless communications device 100 downloads instruction via antenna 210 of transceiver 140); the long distance call restriction information being indicative of one or more country codes or area codes (par. 3 lines 10-14, pars. 4, 9, 23, and 25), memory (i.e. memory 130) for storing the received long distance call restriction information received from the host enterprise server (paragraphs 0003, 0006 lines 11-13, par. 17 lines 5-10, and pars. 26-27, inherently, stored information can be downloaded from a host enterprise server); a user interface which is configured to receive a telephone call attempt from the wireless device of the individual(see figure 1, figure 2 step 220, paragraph 0006 lines 13-17, and paragraph 0022, i.e. input device 170); a controller which is configured to: determine whether the call attempt is restricted by the long distance call restriction information (see figure 1, figure 2 step 250, paragraph 0006 lines 17-21, and paragraph 0022, i.e. controller 120); if the call attempt is restricted by the long distance call restriction information, restrict the call attempt from the wireless device (paragraphs 00022-0023); and if the call attempt is not restricted by the long distance call restriction information, allow the call attempt from the wireless device (paragraphs 00022-0023).

However, Kirbas et al. fails to disclose the call restriction information received from a host enterprise server of a private communication network of the enterprise

which is outside of the wireless communication network within which the wireless device operates.

Campen discloses the call restriction information received from a host enterprise server of a private communication network of the enterprise which is outside of the wireless communication network within which the wireless device operates (see figure 1 and pars. 12-16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Kirbas et al., and have the call restriction information received from a host enterprise server of a private communication network of the enterprise which is outside of the wireless communication network within which the wireless device operates for the purpose of using received restriction information in controlling usage of the device.

However, Campen fails to disclose the host enterprise server having the long distance call restriction information stored in a user profile which is unique to the individual and being one of a plurality of user profiles for individuals of the enterprise.

Elsy discloses the host enterprise server (see figure 1, pars. 6, 47, and 64-67, switch host computer 106) having the long distance call restriction information stored in a user profile which is unique to the individual and being one of a plurality of user profiles for individuals of the enterprise (121-134).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Campen, and have the host enterprise server having the long distance call restriction information stored in a user profile which

Art Unit: 2617

is unique to the individual and being one of a plurality of user profiles for individuals of the enterprise for the purpose of storage and retrieval.

**Regarding claims 2 and 6, the combination of Kirbas et al., Campen and Elsey** discloses the method of claim 1, however, the combination fails to disclose further comprising a wireless tunnel through the wireless communication network over which the long distance call restriction information is pushed to the wireless device (par. 22).

**Regarding claim 3, the combination of Kirbas et al., Campen and Elsey** discloses the wireless device of claims 1 and 5, acts of the method are performed for each one of a plurality of wireless communication devices associated with the plurality of user profiles of the enterprise (Elsey et al., pars. 65 lines 3-7).

**Regarding claims 4, 7, and 8, the combination of Kirbas et al., Campen and Elsey** discloses the wireless device of claims 1 and 5 wherein the act of receiving comprises the further act of receiving the long distance call restriction information from the host enterprise server which is further utilized to regularly synchronize data items between an application of the wireless device and the host enterprise server (Kirbas et al., par. 3 lines 10-14, and pars. 26-27, port 190).

**Regarding claim 9, the combination of Kirbas et al., Campen and Elsey**

discloses the wireless device of claim 5, further comprising: wherein the radio modem receives long distance call restriction information of the user profile which uniquely corresponds to a mobile or subscriber identifier stored in the wireless device (Kirbas et al., pars. 21-24).

**Regarding claim 10, the combination of Kirbas et al., Campen and Elsey**

discloses the wireless device of claim 5, further comprising: a smart card interface for receiving a smart card; and wherein the radio modem receives long distance call restriction information of the user profile which uniquely corresponds to an identifier stored on the smart card (Kirbas et al., see figure 1, and paragraph 0017).

3. **Claims 14-16 and 18**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirbas et al. in view of U.S. Publication No. 2006/0210046 A1 Smith, and further in view of Elsey.

**Regarding claims 14 and 16, Kirbas et al. discloses in a wireless**

communication device for use by an individual of an enterprise, a method of providing restrictions on long distance calls from the wireless communication device comprising the acts of: receiving from a user interface of a wireless device of the individual, a selection of plurality of telephone call digits of a telephone number associated with a telephone call attempt for a telephone call from the wireless device: in response transmitting to a host enterprise server (see figures 1, and 2, and paragraphs 0006, 0021, and 0022). However, Kirbas et al. fails to disclose a controller which is configured

Art Unit: 2617

to: cause a query request to be transmitted to a host computer network through the radio modem to identify whether a telephone call to the telephone number should be inhibited based on long distance call restriction, determine whether the call attempt is restricted by comparing a country code or area code of a telephone number of the call attempt with the one or more country the long distance call restriction information.

Smith discloses a query request to be transmitted to a host enterprise server of a private communication network of the enterprise, through that radio modem to identify whether a telephone call to the telephone number should be restricted based information stored in the private communication network; receiving, from the host enterprise server of the private communication network, a response to the query request which is based on a comparison of a call restriction information performed at host enterprise server (pars. 36, 76-84), if the response is positive, allowing the telephone call; and if the response is negative, restricting the telephone call, and providing an audible or visual alert at the wireless device (par. 55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Kirbas et al. as disclosed by Smith above for the purpose of screening calls that are made based on call restriction information.

However, Smith fails to disclose a host enterprise server of a private communication network of the enterprise which is outside of the wireless communication network within which the wireless device operates.

Elsey discloses a host enterprise server (see figure 1, pars. 6, 47, and 64-67, switch host computer 106) of a private communication network of the enterprise which



is outside of the wireless communication network within which the wireless device operates (121-134).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Smith, and have a host enterprise server of a private communication network of the enterprise which is outside of the wireless communication network within which the wireless device operates for the purpose of information download.

**Regarding claim 15, the combination of Kirbas et al., Smith, and Elsey** discloses the method of claim 14, comprising the further act of: transmitting the query only if the telephone number is identified as being a long distance telephone number (Kirbas et al., paragraphs 0006, and 0022).

**Regarding claim 18, the combination of Kirbas et al., Smith, and Elsey** discloses in a wireless communication device of claim 16 further comprising causing, by the host enterprise server, data items to be synchronized between an application of the wireless device and the host enterprise server (Kirbas et al., pars. 26-27, port 190).

4. **Claims 17, 19, and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S Patent No. 6,081,731 to David Boltz (Boltz et al.) in view of Smith.

**Regarding claims 17, and 19, Boltz et al.** discloses a method of providing restrictions of long distance calls from a wireless communication device for an individual in the enterprise, for each of a plurality of individuals in the enterprise, the method comprising the acts of: maintaining storage of long distance call restriction information in a user profile associated with the individual of the enterprise, the long distance call restriction information being indicative of one or more country codes or area codes (col. 2 line 63 - col. 3 line 16, and col. 3 lines 65 – col. 4 line 11); receiving, through a wireless communication network, a query request from a wireless communication device of the individual in response to an attempt to place a telephone call to a telephone number from the wireless device through the wireless communication network, where the query request includes data indicative of a country code or area code of the telephone number (col. 3 lines 1-19); in response to the query request, searching the long distance call restriction information to identify whether the telephone call with the country code or area code should be allowed or restricted by comparing a county code or area code of a telephone number of the call attempt with the one or more country codes or area codes of the long distance call restriction information; and causing a response to be sent to the wireless device which indicates whether the telephone call to the telephone number is allowed or restricted based on the comparison (col. 2 line 63 - col. 3 line 29, col. 3 line 54 – col. 4 line 29, and col. 5 lines 40-45).

In a similar field of endeavor, Smith discloses in a host enterprise server of a private computer network of an enterprise (see figures 1-5, and par. 19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Boltz et al., and have a host enterprise server of a private computer network of an enterprise as disclosed by Smith for the purpose of utilizing the method in a private network to provide call processing (par. 19 lines 10-12).

**Regarding claim 21, the combination of Boltz et al. and Smith** discloses the host enterprise server of claim 19, wherein the host enterprise server is further configured to, for each one of the wireless communication devices for the individuals of the enterprise, regularly cause data items between an application of the wireless device and the host enterprise server to be synchronized via the wireless communication network (Smith, pars.21-23, AIN module).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. **Claims 11-13** are allowed.

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EMEM EKONG whose telephone number is 571 272 8129. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 Mon-Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on 571 272 7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



EE  
5/17/07



LESTER G. KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER